

**REMARKS**

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over WITTKE et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059705) in view of MIYASAKA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,990,633) and YU (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0009497). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.<sup>1</sup>

By way of the present amendment, Applicants propose amending claim 54 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the proposed amendment. Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 would remain pending upon entry of the proposed amendment.

Independent claim 23 recites a method that includes receiving a plurality of search queries from a user; creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries; receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections; retrieving items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries; and inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Applicants' claim 23.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons for modifying a reference and/or combining references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest, among other features, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in amended claim 23. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 23 (final Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

At paragraph 260, WITTKE et al. discloses:

The knowledge system of this invention A) effectively integrates information from diverse sources, B) verifies, adds to or enhances source metadata (product data sheet; article title), and C) searches, queries, retrieves, and aggregates information. It identifies "things" people want, need and/or desire, given all the information and misinformation that's abundant in the world. It not only locates "things" for people, but also enriches their lives. It gives them more life. It "touches" people beyond helping them find that book they're looking for. It helps people live more and grow as people. It helps the person who from when they were a child wanted to become an actress but due to life's circumstances was never able to pursue their passion: there are countless people in the world with untapped passions and interests waiting to be unleashed with proper nurturing and guidance. The new knowledge system teaches people. It knows who someone is as a person--their personality, background, interests, etc.--to more effectively and efficiently teach them.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses retrieving and aggregating information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news

sections of a customized news document. Aggregating information is not equivalent to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 281, WITTKE et al. discloses:

FIG. 14B describes the sequence of events. After the mentor suggests a change to the database, an administrator is notified (email or instant alert) of the request for an addition. Upon approval via another set of user screens, the administrator approves (could also deny) of the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. For those people whom are currently connected as in web/internet—the next time their browser updates they will have new database structure information. All automatic. It's similar to adding a new directory on your computer to store stuff (Word docs—pictures, etc.) but being able to search, query, aggregate, etc. The stuff is stored in there automatically. (Attachment A sets forth the XML source code for performing the Add/Drop of Database Nodes function. The source code could be in other software languages.)

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. This section of WITTKE et al. deals with updating a database and does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 325, WITTKE et al. discloses:

As previously mentioned and observable in FIG. 8, the PPE generates a Personality/Preference Token 22 per each client of the system. The token--as the title implies--stores a client selectable subset of information particular to them. In other words depending on their personal desires, they can increase and decrease the set of information stored per their token. This token or electronic collection of personal information has a number of uses, one of which is shown in FIG. 36 where a user may make the token available to third-party web sites which upon reading the token can customize the web-site offering to that client. The ACAS system enables users to customize their collection of information.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client. The token may, for example, be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

Paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 19. At paragraph 291, WITTKE et al. discloses:

FIG. 19 describes further how information from diverse sources in different formats with varying metadata is translated, classified, and stored in databases 27. Once again we see the information received is enhanced with additional metadata and recast into other forms and formats 40, all of which are also entered into the databases 27. The data received from one publisher has a high probability of being different from that of another. The information received from a single source must be translated 39 into formats and equivalents to that dictated by the CML 12. If in fact all sources adhered to a common

descriptive standard, such translation would be minimized if not eliminated. But the nature of a free marketplace and a free world makes universal compliance to a single common standard highly unrealistic. Therefore such translation is required for the foreseeable future.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information is not equivalent to inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Furthermore, databases 27 of WITTKE et al. is not equivalent to a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At column 13, lines 26-40, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

A second way divides the document content such that a presentation of a first part of the content fits in the designated area and the remaining content is omitted. Preferably, some indication of the omission such as "More" or "Remainder omitted" is included in the article presentation. A document name or some document-access information such as a URL link for the full content of the document may be provided.

Optionally, the recipient may be allowed to specify a maximum or preferred length of an article presentation, which could cause part of the second part to be omitted. If part is omitted, the presentation could include some indication of omission as described above. The length may be specified in essentially any manner such as the number of characters, number of lines, number of paragraphs, number of columns or column-inches, or number of pages.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest specifying a number of news items to include in a personalized news section. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraphs 52, YU discloses:

As mentioned before, an important idea suggested by the current invention is that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in or communities instead of just individual users. When interest counts are stored relative to user communities, not only can the individual user's browsing behavior be used to select the specific content that is delivered to the user in the future, but the collective behavior of the communities can be mined and analyzed to deliver target content to the individual user as well. Community personalization can be a powerful notion in the art of personalization. The community bike news embodiment shows one way to personalize content based on community preferences and/or behaviors. Similar types of personalization based on preferences shown by sets of communities can be easily devised.

This section of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences is not equivalent to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a customized news document. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraphs 55-57, YU discloses that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based “best guess” search results based on the generic search results that are relevant to specific communities of users. While this section of YU mentions the word “personalized,” this section of YU does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document, let alone inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 23 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 24-30 and 68 depend from claim 23. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Independent claim 31 recites a news aggregation server that includes a memory configured to store instructions and news content; and a processing unit configured to execute the instructions in memory to: obtain a plurality of search queries from a user, create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries, retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries, receive an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news

sections, rank, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order, and insert the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Applicants' claim 31.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIGS. 19 and 31 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 31 (final Office Action, pp. 7-8). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. Searching and aggregating information is not equivalent to receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections. In fact, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest a personalized new section at all. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving an indication from

the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Updating a database is in no way equivalent to inserting retrieved items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et

al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information in a database is not the same as inserting selected items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the

customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

Paragraph 305 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 31. At paragraph 305, WITTKE et al. discloses:

FIG. 31 pictorially describes how an originating user as well as a mentor of the CES system in most circumstances interacts with it for remote data and information entry, using a personal computer, the internet, and secure communications. As mentioned previously all three of the above instruments are well known and documented. Thus data and information can be recorded as the source material is created.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the entry of data, from a user or system mentor, to a remote database using a personal computer via the Internet. Entering data into a database is not equivalent to inserting selected items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, paragraph 305 and FIG. 31 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news

sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences is not equivalent to inserting a user specified-number of selected items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a customized news document. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a customized news document. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based “best guess” search results based on the generic search results that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news

sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that WITTKE et al. discloses the above feature of claim 31 and relies on paragraphs 0367 and paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. for support (final Office Action, pg. 2). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraph 0367, WITTKE et al. discloses:

In order to deliver information according to user selections, data must be ranked relative to other pieces of information. An index or ranking is calculated per data which falls within the user's chosen spheres of interest. This ranking is a weighted scoring technique. The user sets the weights associated with the parameters used in the logic, as well as those parameters to be included. In other words the user may choose to rank and deliver information solely based on his/her node ranking, ignoring other possible discretionary settings such as level of detail, ease of read or source of information. The ranking equation here shown has three weighted elements; this is merely an example; as indicated, actual ranking logic will vary.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses ranking data by using a weighted scoring technique designated by a user. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses ranking, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of

news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

At paragraphs 0378-0380, WITTKE et al. discloses:

Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders—for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

Part of what the ADS 9 system does, is reconciling information/data throughout multiple listings. FIG. 53 demonstrates how a user is able to reconcile and update information per multiple mediums. Melissa listens to 4 audio segments—items A through D while on the way to work. As she listening to the segments, she has—through the software—noted the action to be taken per selection. During her lunch break those chosen items are deleted while those new ones E and F, and C which she wants to read are available in the new selection. Her next-morning audio selections reflect choices made the previous day.

Thus the system's reconciliation apparatus allows users to have one or more aggregated listings per topic and per several delivery mediums. As another example, Pete might have a group of topics related to his profession and another group related to his hobby. Pete would have two running lists of material being presented to him per the two groupings. Pete might also choose a third group of topics which he likes to listen to during his commute to and from work in the car, say on gardening. In this case, Pete has three independent groupings which have two delivery methods—the first two via web/text and the third via audio selections. Pete, could however decide to both listen to and read information about his profession. In other words, he might want to listen to a portion in the morning and read the rest during his lunch hour. This invention allows Pete to manage aggregated listings independently and/or across mediums. The system allows him to delete an article he listened to in the car so that it does not appear in the text listing during his lunch hour.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses selecting items for storage in folders that are candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses aggregating content, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized

news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 39 recites similar features to (though possibly having different scope than) the features of claim 23. Therefore, claim 39 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Independent claim 40 recites similar features to (though possibly having different scope than) the features of claim 31. Therefore, claim 40 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 31.

Claims 41-45 and 47-53 depend from claim 40. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. These claims also include additional features not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

For example, claim 44 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section

comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items. The Examiner relies on paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 44 (final Office Action, pg. 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the receipt of data by a user via an email attachment or similar delivery service. This section of WITTKE et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 44.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 44 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 47 further recites receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 373-378 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 47 (Office Action, pg. 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraphs 0373-0378, WITTKE et al. discloses:

Possible choices in handling information after it's delivered are:  
Delete Everything--"give me totally new material every week"  
Keep an article in current listing--"I want to read this latter."  
Delete this particular article--"Done with it."

Mark this item for storage and forwarding--"Put this in my "Send-to-Joe" folder"  
Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders--for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses various options a user may select to handle information, including deleting the information, keeping the information for later reading, marking the information for forwarding to other users, or marking the information for further processing.

This section of WITTKE et al., however, does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords, as recited in claim 47.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that WITTKE et al. discloses the above feature of claim 47 and relies on paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. for support (final Office Action, pp. 2-3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

As discussed above with respect to claim 31, paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. disclose selecting items for storage in folders that are candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords, as recited in claim 47.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 47 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 48 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE for allegedly disclosing these features (final Office Action, pg. 13). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

Paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose that a user can specify what news or information they desire to receive, how they want the news or information presented to them and how they want the information updated and stored. This section of WITTKE, however, does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content. Therefore, WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 48.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 48 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 49 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news. The Examiner relies on FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features (final Office Action, pg. 13). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose the addition or removal of tree nodes from a database, such as, for example, adding a tree sub-node called "tennis" to the database under a node called "sports." This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content. Therefore, WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news, as recited in claim 49.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 49 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

Independent claim 54 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 23. Therefore, claim 54 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Claims 55-63 depend from claim 54. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54.

Independent claim 64 recites a method that includes crawling, using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers; fetching news content from the crawled news content documents; indexing the fetched news content to produce indexed news content; dividing a news document into a plurality of news sections; receiving a first user search query; searching the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 64.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 64 (final Office Action, pp. 18-19). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users

based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. Searching for and aggregating information is not the same as populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Updating a database is not equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching

indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information is not equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news

document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences is in no way equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based “best guess” search results based on the generic search results that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 64 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 65-67 depend from claim 64. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 64.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60,112/  
Meagan S. Walling  
Registration No. 60,112

Date: August 4, 2008

Harrity Snyder, L.L.P.  
11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
Main: (571) 432-0800

Customer Number: **44989**